

HERNANDO COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
BROOKSVILLE CITY COUNCIL

JOINT PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MINUTES

August 5, 2004

6:00 P.M.

Brooksville City Council and Hernando County Board of County Commissioners met in special session with Mary A. Staib, Mayor, Joe Bernardini, Vice Mayor, and Council Members, Richard E. Lewis and E.E. Wever, Jr present from the Brooksville City Council. Chairwoman Nancy Robinson, Vice Chair Diane Rowden, and Commissioners Mary Aiken, Thomas Mylander and Robert Schenck present from the Board of County Commissioners. Also present were David LaCroix, City Attorney; Garth Collier, County Attorney; Jeff Kirk, Assistant County Attorney; Richard E. Anderson, City Manager; Gary Adams, County Administrator and various City and County Department and Division Heads.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairwoman Robinson at 6:05 p.m., followed by a moment of silence and the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

BILL GEIGER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR, CITY OF BROOKSVILLE advised there will be a lot of information presented to the Board relating to the public infrastructure in the joint planning area which included the south side of Brooksville and running south to Powell Road.

LARRY JENNINGS, DIRECTOR OF GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, HERNANDO COUNTY stated the Board would be discussing issues involved in surrounding areas of the City of Brooksville. He stated the joint meeting was a good opportunity for communication through both Board's.

County Administrator Adams announced the notice of the joint City/County public meeting was published on July 29, 2004 in the Hernando Today.

CITIZENS INPUT ADDED TO AGENDA

County Chairperson Robinson asked for the consensus of both Board's to add public input as item 5 and change the adjournment to item 6.

The Board and City Council agreed.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (Attachment I)

Director Jennings reported the purpose of the steering committee report in the packets was to formally present the report to both Board's. He stated it was

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

prepared by both City and County staff and most of the items were a joint collaboration.

PLANNING ACTIVITIES POTENTIALLY AFFECTING THE JOINT PLANNING AREA

A. EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT

Director Jennings announced the County's Evaluation and Appraisal Report was completed, which the City participated in, and was subsequently approved on July 14, 2004 by the County Commission and forwarded to Department of Community Affairs for compliance review. He also stated the County is in preparation of updating the comprehensive plan which would be done over the next eighteen months.

Director Geiger advised the County participated in the City's Evaluation and Appraisal Report also.

B. WATER SUPPLY PLANNING (COUNTY & CITY)

Director Jennings stated the project is in the early stages, the city will be kept informed of the progress on the matter.

Director Geiger read the City's section of item B from the Steering Committee Report into the record.

C. WASTEWATER FACILITIES PLANNING (COUNTY & CITY)

Director Jennings reported the County is also in the process of developing a wastewater facility planning project and advised the consultant of the first right-to-serve area that will be taken into consideration as the project develops. He also stated staff will continue to coordinate with the City.

Director Geiger advised the City has old infrastructure in the City and some of the lines are approximately seventy years old. He further reported that the City had been fortunate and received a Water Advisory Panel grant and legislative funding of approximately three million over the last four years that deals with line testing, replacement and renewal and fixing the old system. Director Geiger also mentioned the lines are extending south U.S. 41 to serve the County Fairgrounds and Southern Hills Plantation to S.R. 50 West to the north side of the rights-of-way and terminating at Lykes Dublin Road. He reported plans are underway to increase the City's capacity within a two to three year period by .5 mgd, and within a five to six year period an increase to 1.5 mgd for a total of 3.0 mgd.

Commissioner Aiken asked if the PHCC well field would withstand high winds and would it cost more. Director Geiger informed her the structure would be engineered and designed to be built to withstand the high wind force, and he stated the cost would be the same no matter where it is built.

D. DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS LOCATED WITHIN THE JOINT PLANNING AREA THAT ARE IN BOTH CITY AND COUNTY FIRST RIGHT-TO-SERVE UTILITY AREAS

1. MAJESTIC OAKS

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

Director Geiger noted the project is approximately four hundred and thirty-three acres in size and about eighty percent of it is located within the city's first right-to-serve area. He also advised the City is in the process of negotiating a utility service agreement with the developer.

2. BROOKSVILLE REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Director Geiger advised the hospital is currently under construction with the County providing utilities. He stated that when the interlocal agreement was negotiated, the understanding was the City would be providing the utilities for the medical offices built in conjunction with the hospital. Director Geiger felt it was important to extend lines in that direction to accommodate future growth and development that would occur as a result of the hospital at that location and advised the City felt this was an opportune time for discussion with the County regarding the standby supply or interconnection with the utility systems.

Chairperson Robinson stated as she remembered it, when they prepared the first right-to-serve map that the interconnect was a key element and would be very beneficial to the hospital and asked if that would take place. Director Geiger stated it was in the capital facilities plan to extend those lines out to that location and he anticipates this would be the end result. Director Jennings advised there is a defined right of refusal area for both of the projects and the agreement has provisions on who will serve the area.

Commissioner Aiken asked if the County was servicing the area near the Country Club. Director Jennings pointed out this was for County does provide service to Dogwood Estates and the City provides to Cloverleaf. He again referenced the first right of refusal area. She asked if the City took over Majestic Oaks, would the customer bills double. Director Jennings stated there is a completely new development to the south of the existing Dogwood Estates area called Majestic Oaks. He also stated the same developer was doing some redevelopment in the boundaries of Dogwood Estates but was not sure what that development would be called. Director Geiger explained the current agreement in negotiations was only for the new development and does not involve any existing portions of Dogwood Estates. Commissioner Aiken felt she did not want to see the residents be caught in the middle of the juggle on who will service the area.

E. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE JOINT PLANNING AREA (COUNTY & CITY)

Director Jennings reported the County had three projects programmed in the joint planning area. He stated the first of the projects was to complete the construction of Jasmine to Mondon Hill and realign the road to intersect with McIntyre. Secondly is to design construction work to improve the intersection of Howell Avenue and US 41. And finally, bring McIntyre up to standards as a County collector road to provide an increase of ability for traffic to move on the east side of the City.

Director Jennings advised the Parks and Recreation Department capital improvement projects were the Sheriff's office substation playground equipment. He also stated the on-going discussion of the County community park at the old DPW complex, and finally, continuing to add facilities at Kennedy Park.

Director Jennings concluded that the water and sewer capital projects were to extend service to the Brooksville Regional Hospital new site, the development of

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

a south central Hernando well field and water plant, and upgrades to the Dogwood Estates water system.

Director Geiger reported the City's road capital improvements in the joint planning area were State Road 50 reverse frontage road project where leverage funding would be used from the CDBG Economic Development grant and the Transportation Outreach grant; Southern Hills Boulevard (east-west road); the north-south collector road which will interconnect with the east-west road and run through SR 50; and, planning to extend Barnett Road to serve as a frontage road on SR 50 to interconnect with the road once built.

Director Jennings questioned when the developer would be approaching the County staff regarding the right-of-way across from the Fairgrounds on the north-south collector road. Director Geiger explained it was covered in the supplemental agreement, and it would be at a point in time when the construction plans are put together when it is specified. He stated the County would be seeing plans a lot sooner as it relates to the right-of-way which the developer anticipates would come forward in September.

Director Geiger advised of the Parks and Recreation capital projects which the City is currently working on to obtain funding to construct the Good Neighbor Trailhead facility as well as a portion of the trail up to Jasmine Boulevard.

Director Geiger reported the planned utility capital projects were the Hope Hill and PHCC well field project, which is to design and construct water wells and elevated storage tanks; SR 50 west utility extension project, which is a design and construction of water and sewer lines; and the US 41 utility extension project, which is design and construction of water and sewer reuse lines to Southern Hills Plantation.

F. COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS (AIRPORT AND CIE)

Director Jennings reported in July 2004 the County approved for transmittal the annual update of capital improvement portion of the Comprehensive Plan and adopted Amendment to the land use portion relating to the Airport. He advised the County enhanced the planning activities on-going at the Airport to reflect the industrial commercial development and increase aviation activity. Director Jennings stated the plan was adopted and submitted to DCA for compliance review.

G. CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS (FLU MAP AMENDMENTS)

Director Geiger reported on August 2, 2004 the City Council approved the transmittal of the City's first large scale amendment process for 2004. He advised the amendment involved five large scale land use plan amendments. Director Geiger stated three of the amendments were public facilities, two of them involved the annexation of state road right-of-ways for safety purposes and the third is the Hope Hill well field site. He explained the other two involved were the proposed site for Lowes Home Improvement and a mobile home facility owned by Charles Sasser to be used as two-hundred and forty room condominium.

Chairperson Robinson asked if there would be a frontage road involved. Director Geiger replied there will be in the future, but the zoning has not yet been done.

Commissioner Mylander asked what kind of area and what is involved with the

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

mobile homes. Director Geiger replied the City's land use category is setup for multi-family/mobile homes which provides for either/or, and stated to establish any kind of mobile home park the property owner would have to go through the City's PDP zoning process and be approved by City Council. Commissioner Mylander explained his question was on the basis of evacuation of mobile homes.

H. HERNANDO COUNTY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION'S LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Transportation Planning Coordinator Dennis Dix reviewed the County's long range transportation update through 2025. He advised the red represents six lanes, green represents four lanes, and bold black represents two lane divided. He explained all of SR 50 would be six lanes from US 19 to McKethan Road. Coordinator Dix advised County Line Road is currently two lanes and proposed as six lanes all the way to US 19 and Marnier, and four lane all the way to US 41. He mentioned the yellow bold highlight represents frontage road construction which is on SR 50, US 19 and US 41 corridors in addition to a section of Cobb Road and US 41 north of Brooksville. Coordinator Dix stated that I-75 would be six lanes and the highest priority to the south by FDOT. He reported the City of Brooksville road projections were SR 50 - six lanes with the frontage road; Cobb Road - four lanes; Jefferson Street and Ponce De Leon south of Yontz - 2 lane divided roadway with sufficient capacity. Coordinator Dix stated US 41, by the Hilltop to Lake Lindsay Road, has a need to be four lanes, but asked if there was still a desire and asked for policy direction.

Mayor Staib read City Council Member Johnston's memo relating to item 4-H into the record.

Vice Mayor Bernardini asked what the plan was to redesign the intersection when the time comes to widen the roads at US 41 and Mondon Hill since it is a dangerous intersection at the bottom of the hill and at a curve. Coordinator Dix replied the County had no plans at this time but would certainly look into it.

Director Jennings stated the issue from a long range projection plan is to see what type of road network is needed twenty years in the future by planning and programming development activities along the way and to secure right-of-ways. Vice Mayor Bernardini asked if the four lane project does not occur, where there any plans on improving the intersection as more traffic is added regardless of what happens with the four lane project. Director Geiger advised the City does not have any specific plans since it is a FDOT right-of-way and would need to go to the MPO Board. Director Jennings stated the item would be added to the next MPO agenda. Commissioner Rowden asked why the City would not want the portion of the road four laned. Vice Mayor Bernardini replied the position was from Council Member Johnston who was not present to explain himself. Commissioner Rowden clarified the position was only of Council Member Johnston and not the entire City Council.

Commissioner Aiken inquired about the gray line east of US 41 below the bypass. Coordinator Dix commented the map is based on the year 2025, to which Director Jennings advised the road does not exist yet.

Director Geiger advised this time line for the east-west collector road is proposed for the first quarter of the year 2005 and the north-south is scheduled for the year 2008.

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

Commissioner Aiken asked if the road is private or public based on how the last meeting with the Developer. Director Geiger commented the City feels that connectivity should be achieved and is currently working with the developer to achieve the connectivity.

Commissioner Schenck inquired if the future land use was residential or rural. Director Jennings advised that there is a residential and rural commercial urban area to the northeast of the City. He stated the reason to four lane US 41 is due to future land use issues. Commissioner Schenck asked if the County had the adequate right-of-way to make the improvements at this time. Director Jennings confirmed the County did not have the right-of-way and with planning it would help prepare for the future.

Vice Mayor Bernardini commented on Council Member Johnston's position on the constraints relating to the future roadway project stating that by the City inputting their position in the beginning, it would not end up in the same situation as when the State designed US 41 south. He noted to the best of his recollection Council did not officially concur with Council Member Johnston's request to the MPO.

Council Member Lewis also commented on the constraints and he stated the time frame was for a one year period and was to be reviewed again the following year. He asked if the County was planning on building a north-south collector road on the west side, between Wiscon Road and Powell Road. Coordinator Dix replied the only roadway they are showing in their projections would be the creation of the bypass.

Director Geiger felt it was important for the City to consider since they were not planning for future needs if the road was constrained. He agreed with Director Jennings by participating the City would be able to plan for the future better and would have input, and suggested Council take that approach.

RESOLUTIONS OF ISSUES

County Planning Director Jennings reiterated the City has adopted their comprehensive plan and it was found in compliance. Staff has taken the actions to zone portions of the Hampton Ridge property. He also stated there has been coordination with the County and City on the development plans and zoning activities, and felt the planning agreement is working as envisioned.

CURRENT ISSUES

I. SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT TO THE JOINT PLANNING AGREEMENT - DISCUSSION OF COLLECTOR ROAD

Director Geiger reiterated the City's need for connectivity to work with the developer to come up with a resolution to plan for the future. He stated the major issue of the developer was whether to make the road public or private. Director Geiger stated the developer wanted a private road which the City felt was a connectivity issue. He reviewed the options given to the developer which the developer felt were not acceptable since there were issues relating to the loss of developability of the parcel and making the development work from their prospective. Director Geiger noted other alternatives were looked at, such as an alternative road that would go around the property. He added the associated

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

problem with that was it would put the problem back with the City or County on how to pay for the road and how to acquire a right-of-way for it. Director Geiger stated the potential answer would be removing the impact fee credit areas that were established as part of the development agreement with Hampton Ridge. The City received a recent proposal from the developer, that has not been discussed with City Council at this point, to enable the developer to construct a road through their property that would achieve connectivity between Powell Road and the east-west road that would be built to a local road standard and not a collector road standard. Director Geiger reported the savings the developer would achieve and the difference between building it between those two standards would be \$500,000 to \$600,000. He stated the developer would be compelled, through an agreement, to acquire the needed right-of-way to establish the road corridor and to give up their impact fee credit area.

Director Jennings advised the issue of concern to the County is to have some connectivity between Powell Road and SR 50. He felt it could be made to work and suggested from the County's prospective they would need to look into the details of some type of agreement and the terms. Director Jennings noted they wanted to make sure the County's cost interests were appropriately served.

Vice Mayor Bernardini asked about the proposed white road on the map, where it crosses the red road, as he understood it was the reverse frontage road. Director Geiger explained it would serve as a partial reverse frontage road and actually have a higher speed limit and less activity from individuals from properties. Cliff Manuel, Coastal Engineering, replied the concept of the road was to be realigned to provide the network and the benefit of both the reverse frontage road and connectivity from SR 50 to Powell Road. He explained the issues would include how much access to the roadways is allowed and how much right-of-way is proposed for that function. The concept would be realigned and serve that as a reverse frontage and collector road for that area and does not preclude the commercial area would have other connectivity. Vice Mayor Bernardini asked if it would be proposed still as a four lane roadway. Mr. Manuel advised it would still be constructed as a two lane roadway and proposed as a four lane roadway for future needs.

Commissioner Rowden was concerned with the City and County jumping through hoops for the developer relating to the impact fee credits. Director Geiger reported most of the roads would be private roads to the development and off-site roads would be impact fee eligible.

Council Member Lewis advised the CDD's that were setup for the development are the same as an MSBU or MSTU and it is for a level of service. He stated the owners are made aware of the fees up front. He also noted the developer of Hernando Oaks was not required to build a north-south collector road in the development; they were only required to build an east-west road that was private. Council Member Lewis explained the City would need to acquire the right of way at this time in order to prevent future problems.

Commissioner Schenck agreed that connectivity had been achieved, and staff would present a cost benefit based on when the road would be constructed and how long it would take to receive the impact fees. He also noted it would be brought back to Council and the Board at a later time. Director Geiger advised staff would work with the developer and would provide information to County staff. Chairperson Robinson felt the County should seriously consider the proposal.

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

Director Jennings agreed, and advised County staff would review and report back to the Board at a later date.

Mayor Staib read the remainder of Council Member Johnston's memo into the record. (Attachment II)

Council Member Lewis noted Council Member Johnston did not have the most current information from the developer.

The consensus of City Council was to hold off on any decision until Council Member Johnston had been provided the updated information.

Vice Mayor Bernardini inquired if only the south impact fee credit area was under consideration or both the north and south impact fee credit areas. Director Geiger replied the road is not needed today but possibly in the future to consider the connectivity and both would be considered.

Chairperson Robinson noted the road would serve as a frontage road to US 41 and would depend on the development of the area. She also felt the road could be designed for future needs at the time of development.

Council Member Wever requested an indication from the engineer if the road could be used as a frontage road and through road.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m. for a brief recess and reconvened at 7:50 p.m.

Cliff Manuel, Coastal Engineering, advised the developer proposed the alternative that they would build the road up front and would provide the City with \$500,000 to acquire the right of way, which would also allow the developer to build the private community without the responsibility.

CITIZENS INPUT

Sherry McIntyre

Ms. McIntyre stated she was happy Southern Hills is coming to the community but felt very concerned for giving up the impact fee credits. She felt the purple area on the map would be hard to get back and the yellow area would increase rapidly. Ms. McIntyre also wondered who would pay for the improvements at Wiscon Road and asked for Council and the Board to consider what needs to be done in the next five years relating to collecting impact fee credits.

Janey Baldwin

Ms. Baldwin congratulated the accomplishment of the City and County working together. She reported she spoke with City Clerk Phillips and was informed the City does not have a strategic plan for 2025 at this time and suggested a summit to address the situation.


Anna Liisa Covell

Ms. Covell advised she had spoken with Mr. King regarding the impact fee credits on the frontage/collector road, and stated it would need to be built as a collector road standard in order to collect impact fees.

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Vice Chair Rowden moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 p.m. and seconded by County Commissioner Schenck.



City Clerk

ATTEST: _____
Mayor

:lam

G:\WP_WORK\ClerkOffice\MINUTES\2004\08-05-04jntmtg.wpd

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

**STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT
TO
BROOKSVILLE/HERNANDO COUNTY
JOINT PLANNING BOARD**

**For Presentation on
August 5, 2004**

**Prepared
by
Hernando County Planning Department
and
City of Brooksville Community Development Department**

July 29, 2004

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

INTRODUCTION

The Joint Planning Agreements between the City of Brooksville and Hernando County adopted on November 12, 2003 create a Joint Planning Board consisting of the combined City Council and Board of County Commissioners. The agreements also provide for a Steering Committee of designated staff from the County and the City to meet no less than semi-annually to set direction, formulate recommendations, and discuss issues regarding coordination of land use, planning, zoning, growth management, environmental considerations, infrastructure, traffic, facilities siting, population and development trends, unmet infrastructure and public facilities needs regarding the US 41 South Planning Area, and any other agreed upon areas of common concern. City and County staffs have met as needed to discuss matters of mutual concern related to the Joint Planning Area.

The agreements also require the County to prepare a report consistent with and approved by the Steering Committee for presentation at least semi-annually to the Joint Planning Board and require the Joint Planning Board to meet no less than once every six months to discuss and/or act on reports of the Steering Committee. The report is directed by the agreements to reflect the Steering Committee's recommended resolutions, progress since previous meeting(s) and items of concern which are outstanding. This is the first of the required semi-annual reports. The contents of this report have been reviewed by both City and County staff.

AGENDA ITEMS

A. County Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR)

The County adopted an EAR on July 14, 2004 as the result of a process begun in March 2002. The EAR process was strongly based in public participation with numerous workshops and public meetings. Governmental entities were invited to participate through a scoping meeting held on March 27, 2003 and attended by representatives of about a dozen governments and agencies, including the City of Brooksville. Prior to adoption a proposed EAR was sent to the City for review and comment (along with other state, regional, and local governments and agencies). The City will have received a copy of the adopted EAR prior to the Joint Planning Board meeting on August 5, as the EAR is due at DCA on August 1, 2004 for sufficiency review. County Planning Staff have begun preparation of the EAR based comprehensive plan amendments which must be adopted within 18 months after DCA's determination of sufficiency.

B. Water Supply Planning

County - The County Utilities Department has initiated a potable water supply planning project. This project is at a very early stage. County staff will inform consultants of the interlocal agreement establishing the water and sewer Right of First Refusal Area and the

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

interlocal agreements establishing the Joint Planning Area. As this project proceeds, the City will be kept informed of matters of potential impact to the Joint Planning Area.

City - City is continuing with the replacement of its older supply wells. The ultimate goal is to construct two new public supply wells at the existing Hope Hill Wellfield, and two at the Pasco-Hernando Community College (PHCC) site. A 250,000-gallon elevated storage tank will be installed at the PHCC site. As of this date one new well at Hope Hill and one test well at PHCC has been completed.

Water and Sewer lines are being extended south on U.S. 41 to serve the Southern Hills Plantation Development and the Fairgrounds. A contract with an engineering firm is in place for the design and permitting of water lines out S.R. 50 west, on the northerly side of the rights-of-way, terminating at Lykes Dublin Road. Every effort will be made to interconnect the City and County systems in this area because the County will be serving the Hospital site which is adjacent to Lykes Dublin Road. The City may require developers to construct other water and sewer infrastructure to serve development within the City's First Right-To-Serve area. Any development which overlaps the City and County Right-To-Serve areas will require coordination between City and County staff to determine which entity will provide utility service.

C. Wastewater Facilities Planning

County - The County Utilities Department has initiated a wastewater facilities planning project which will cover the western part of the County. This project is at a very early stage. County staff have informed consultants of the interlocal agreement establishing the water and sewer Right of First Refusal Area and the interlocal agreements establishing the Joint Planning Area. As this project proceeds, the City will be kept informed of matters of potential impact to the Joint Planning Area.

City - The City's sewer rehabilitation project is well underway. To date 3.0 million \pm in grant funds have been obtained. Smoke testing and videoing of the oldest sewers is underway. Sewer and reuse lines are being extended south along U.S. 41 to serve the County Fairgrounds and Southern Hills Plantation (SHP). A contract with an engineering firm is in place for the design and permitting of sewer lines out S.R. 50 west, on the northerly side of the rights-of-way, terminating at Lykes Dublin Road. Plans are underway to increase the City's sewer treatment capacity by 0.5 mgd within 2-3 years and 1.5 mgd within 5-6 years, for a total capacity of about 3.0 mgd. This expansion will include public access reuse capacity in order to reduce the use of groundwater from our wells.

D. Development Project(s) Located Within the Joint Planning Area that are in Both the City and County First Right-To-Serve Utility Area

- 1. Majestic Oaks** - The Majestic Oaks project is a combined planned development

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

project located near the northeast corner of the intersection of Mondon Hill Road & McIntyre Road. The project area is approximately 433 acres and includes plans for 600+ residential units. Of the 433 acres, approximately 343 acres are within the City's first right-to-serve utility area. The first right-to-serve utility area was established by the City and the County via an interlocal agreement that was adopted August 8, 2002. Pursuant to the agreement and in coordination with the County review process, the City has advised the developer that the City has water and sewer plant capacity to serve this project. The developer is currently in the process of negotiating a utility service agreement with the City.

2. Brooksville Regional Hospital - Brooksville Regional Hospital is currently under construction. The portion of property in which the hospital is being built is located within the County's first right-to-serve area. Per the discussion when the first right-to-serve interlocal agreement was being negotiated, the County is planning to provide utility service to the hospital, and the City will provide service to the related medical office facility. The City is currently planning to run utility (water & sewer) lines west on S.R. 50 to serve development (including the hospital's medical offices), and provide for a potential standby supply arrangement or point of interconnection with the County's utility system.

E. Capital Improvement Projects Within the Joint Planning Area

County - The Capital Improvements Element of *Hernando County's Comprehensive Plan* is updated annually. A proposed comprehensive plan amendment to update the Capital Improvements Element was approved by the BCC on July 14, 2004 for transmittal to DCA. The update includes several projects within the Joint Planning Area which are scheduled to be addressed within the next five years:

COUNTY ROAD PROJECTS IN JOINT PLANNING AREA

Jasmine Road	Right-of-way and Construction Realignment of Intersection with McIntyre Road	\$975,000	2004-2005
Howell Avenue	Design, Right-of-way, and Construction Reworking Intersection With US 41	\$250,000	2004-2005
McIntyre Road	Design, Right-of-way, and Construction Reconstruct to Two Lane Collector	\$700,000	2006-2009
	Roads Total	\$1,925,000	

COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION PROJECTS IN JOINT PLANNING AREA

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

Sheriff's Office Substation	Playground Equipment	\$25,000	2004-2005
Community Park at Old DPW Complex	Park Development	\$50,000	2004-2005
Kennedy Park	Parking, Sidewalks, Ball Fields, Lights, Walking Trails, Playground	\$255,925	2004-2009
	Parks and Recreation Total	\$330,925	

COUNTY WATER AND SEWER PROJECTS IN JOINT PLANNING AREA

Brooksville Regional Hospital Wastewater Transmission System	Force Main Design and Construction	\$398,130	2004-2005
Brooksville Regional Hospital Waterline Extension	Potable Water Line Extension Design and Construction	\$811,870	2004-2005
South Central Hernando Wellfield and Water Plant	Wells, Storage Tank, High-Speed Service Pump Houses and Auxiliaries Land Acquisition and Design	\$425,000	2007-2009
Dogwood Estates Water System Upgrade to Support Fire Hydrant Installation	Water Lines, Storage Tank, and High-Speed Service Pumps Design and Construction	\$635,000	2005-2006
	Water and Sewer Projects Total	\$2,270,000	

City - The Capital Improvements Element of *City of Brooksville's Comprehensive Plan* is updated annually. The most recent amendment to the City's plan was adopted March 15, 2004. Capital improvements and special projects that are currently included in the City's plans for the joint planning area are listed as follows:

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

CITY ROAD PROJECTS IN JOINT PLANNING AREA*

SR 50 Reverse Frontage Road	Design, Right-of-way and Construction and Utility Line work	\$1,500,000	2004-2005
Southern Hills Boulevard (aka East/West Road)	Design, Right-of-way, and Construction 4-Lane Collector Road Section from US 41 to SHP-PDP	\$2,394,000	2004-2005
North/South Collector Road (SR 50-E/W Rd Interconnect)	Design, Right-of-way, and Construction Construct 2-Lane Collector Expandable to a 4-Lane	\$4,155,675	2004-2008
Barnett Road	Design, Right-of-way & Construction Realign Barnett Road with the North/South collector road	\$1,383,100	2004-2008
Road Projects Total		\$9,432,775	

*The majority of City road projects are associated with the Southern Hills Plantation (SHP) development and include a 4-lane entrance road coming off of S.R. 50, across from a proposed entrance for the County's Hernando Oaks development. This entrance road is under construction and extends easterly into the SHP development, about 2,500 LF. It will then intersect with a road which will run northerly through the fairgrounds to S.R. 50. The route of this N/S road is being surveyed at this time to establish a rights-of-way footprint. Preliminary plans for this road will be reviewed by both the City and County prior to the initiation of acquisition activity and final design. All of these roads will be public, City maintained collector roads.

CITY PARKS AND RECREATION PROJECTS IN JOINT PLANNING AREA

Good Neighbor Trail	Design and Construction - Trail Head Development; Pave Trail to Jasmine	\$560,640	2004-2009
Parks and Recreation Total		\$560,640	

CITY UTILITY PROJECTS IN JOINT PLANNING AREA

Hope Hill/PHCC Well field Project	Design & Construction - New Water Wells and Elevated Storage Tank	\$4,900,000	2005-2007
S.R. 50 West Utility Extension Project	Design & Construction - Water & Sewer Lines	\$1,700,000	2004-2005

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

US 41 South Utility Extension Project	Design & Construction -Extend water, sewer & reuse lines to SHP project	\$2,570,000	2004-2006
WWTP Expansion	Design & Construction - Add additional plant capacity and reuse treatment capability	\$3,000,000	2005-2010
Utility Projects Total		\$7,760,000	

F. Comprehensive Plan Amendments (CPAMs)

County - On July 14, 2004, the County approved for transmittal to DCA a proposed CPAM to perform the annual update to the Capital Improvements Element. On July 14, 2004, the County adopted a CPAM to add an airport master plan into *Hernando County's Comprehensive Plan*. This amendment will provide for better airport planning with closer coordination for airport planning and development with the comprehensive plan. Review copies of the proposed and adopted CPAMs will be provided to the City.

City - On August 2, 2004, the City will consider the transmittal to DCA of five Land Use Amendments to its Comprehensive Plan. Three of these are for public uses and two are for private development. All five of the amendments are in conjunction with annexation of land into the City.

Of the three public land use amendments, two are for the inclusion of portions of state road rights-of-way that were annexed into the City's incorporated area with the purpose of improving public safety response needs. The third public land use amendment is a water well and water storage site under the City's ownership that was annexed into the City.

Of the two private land use plan requests, one is for a parcel that was annexed into the City along US Highway 41/Wiscon Road in which the petitioner is requesting a commercial land use designation; and the other is for a property that was annexed on the southwest corner of SR 50 and Mobley Road, in which the petitioner is proposing a residential condominium project with a requested future land use designation of Multifamily/Mobile Home.

Table 1 identifies the proposed amendments.

**Table 1
Future Land Use Map Amendments**

File No.	Existing Designation	Proposed FLU MAP Designation	Location	Ac.	Petitioner
CPA 2004-L1	Residential &	Commercial	SW corner Wiscon Rd/US 41	24.43	Joyce

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

File No.	Existing Designation	Proposed FLU MAP Designation	Location	Ac.	Petitioner
	Commercial (County)	(City)			Malicoate/Norman & Sherry McIntyre (Repres. by Ruden McClosky & Engelhardt Hammer)
CPA 2004-L2	Residential & Rural (County)	Multi-family/ Mobile Home (City)	South side of SR 50/west of Mobley Road	31 32	Charles Sasser (represented by Coastal Engineering)
CPA 2004-L3	AR & Mining (County)	Public Facilities & Land	6975 Hope Hill Road; east & west sides of Hope Hill Road north of John Martin Lane	18 34	City
CPA 2004-L4 & L5	N/A (Public Use)	Public Facilities & Land	various portions of SR 50, US 41, SR 50A & Cobb Road	N/A	City

G. Hernando County MPO's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update

The LRTP is updated at three year intervals with the current update due for completion about December 2004. The first step in the LRTP process is the MPO endorsement in June 2004 of the 2025 Transportation Needs Plan, which identifies transportation improvements needed to support projected growth through the planning period. Over the next two months project costs and anticipated revenues will be evaluated in the development of the Cost Affordable Plan. The LRTP is a multi-modal transportation plan, addressing roads on the functionally classified highway network, goods movements, airport access, public transportation, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

RESOLUTIONS OF ISSUES

Hampton Ridge Annexation and Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Issues which remained outstanding at the time of the last joint meeting of the City Council and the Board of County Commissioners have been resolved. The City's comprehensive plan amendments have been determined to be in compliance by DCA. The City has zoned the Southern Hills Plantation portion of the property and subdivision platting is in process. County staff have provided comments on plans as they have been submitted for review.

PROGRESS SINCE ADOPTION OF JOINT PLANNING AGREEMENTS

Development Review Coordination Procedures

All county rezonings and zoning type cases within the Joint Planning Area are sent to the City for review prior to the advertised public hearings. County coordination processes that were in place before adoption of the joint planning agreements are continuing.

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

Likewise, all City rezonings and zoning type cases within the Joint Planning Area are sent to the County for review prior to the advertised public hearings. City coordination processes that were in place before adoption of the joint planning agreements are continuing. It may be noted that the County Building Department continues to contractually serve as the City's Building Official for purposes of development review, permitting and inspection. As such, all development activity that occurs within the City goes through the County development review process.

CURRENT ISSUES

Highway Network

A representative of the City has discussed the MPO's cooperation in constraining US 41 from Jefferson Street northward within and near the City limits. Classification as "constrained" indicates community policy to maintain a highway within the limitations of the constraint. An example would be a highway prevented from having its right-of-way widened to accommodate more lanes and carry more traffic. Constraining highways in and around the City will limit the amount of new traffic from development that can be accommodated by the highway network, and will necessitate County and City comprehensive plan amendments to reduce the intensity of development in the vicinity of the constrained highways.

Supplemental Agreement to the Joint Planning Agreement - Discussion of Hampton Ridge North-South Collector Road extension to Powell Road

At the joint meeting of the City Council and BOCC on November 12, 2003 where the Joint Planning Agreements were adopted, there was considerable discussion of the collector roads within the 1600 acres of the Hampton Ridge annexation which were added to the highway network in the City's comprehensive plan amendment. Based on the discussion, the County expects those collector roads indicated in the City's comprehensive plan to be public collector roads. County staff consider the public collector roads necessary for connectivity in the highway network, to provide parallel capacity to US 41 and to improve disaster evacuation options for the populated areas to the west.

In response to a developer's request, the City is considering a proposal to replace the southern portion of the North-South Collector Road (from the East-West entrance road south to Powell Road) with a private road. The developer's representatives have provided a traffic analysis and concluded that the public collector road is not needed. County staff do not concur with those conclusions, and consider the public collector road necessary for both connectivity and capacity considerations.

Options which have been reviewed and considered by the City regarding the developer's request include:

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

- A. Have the developer construct the connector road as a public facility and gate the community off the road. The developer rejected this option as being inconsistent with their type of development.
- B. Have the City and County plan an alternative connector road outside of the Hampton Ridge property. This may facilitate the need for future road connectivity but it will represent an expense to the City, County and developer's in this area in the future.
- C. Require future development along the U.S. 41 corridor to construct frontage (or reverse frontage) roads in connection with their development or redevelopment of their property. This should be done regardless of whether the connector road through the Hampton Ridge property is public or private. A problem associated with compelling the construction of frontage roads by developers in conjunction with their projects is the time it takes to achieve connectivity for the road segments to function properly.
- D. If the connector road is permitted (initially) as a private road facility, modify the City's development agreement with Hampton Ridge to reduce the impact fee credit area. This would provide a revenue source for the City to use in conjunction with effecting road connectivity at some point in the future. Although U.S. 41 is classified as a growth corridor, there is no guarantee that the offset in impact fee revenues would be adequate for the City to acquire, design and construct a connector road facility in the future. It may be noted that a large portion of the impact fee credit area as established by the agreement is not located within the incorporated area, and the City would not be able to collect impact fees or establish credits unless the land was annexed and then developed. The developer has indicated a reluctance to agree with eliminating the impact fee credit area west of U.S. 41.

City Staff have prepared the following list of Pros and Cons associated with the petitioner's proposal for the Powell Road Connector to be private versus public:

PRIVATE ROAD FACILITY - PROS

- (1) The road would be constructed to meet City standards, and would already meet public road standards if at some point in the future the City deemed it appropriate to condemn this road to create a public facility.
- B. Construction and maintenance of this road would be at the Developer's cost.
- C. Based on the analysis provided by the Developer, the impacts from the difference (of whether this road is private or public) on the public road network are negligible through the year 2030.
- D. Approximately 900 future dwelling units from the Levitt's planned community would have access to the alternative directions offered by the collector road. 900-units represents approximately 30% of the development potential in this area.

JOINT CITY/COUNTY PLANNING MEETING - AUGUST 5, 2004

ATTACHMENT I

- E. If over time, a reverse frontage road is developed along US 41 connecting the east-west road to Powell Road, the need for an additional (public) Powell Road connector in this area may not be necessary.
- F. Hampton Ridge Developers LLC is willing to consider shrinking the Transportation Impact Fee Reimbursement Area established in the Development Agreement to allow the City to collect and keep impact fees in the area west of the site and south of the east-west road (Assuming this area is eventually annexed and developed, this would provide a funding source to address costs related to the reverse frontage road referenced in #4, including planning, design and construction; and/or costs related to acquiring the Powell Road Connector being constructed by the developer, if deemed necessary to do so at some point in the future).
- G. In all respects other than the private road issue, this development proposal is consistent with City plans for this area and the development would economically benefit the City and the County.

PRIVATE ROAD FACILITY - CONS

- (1) The general public would not have this facility available as an alternative to the existing public road network in this area.
- (2) If future condemnation is required to make this a public road, it would be at the City's cost.
- (3) If development of this road is permitted as a private facility, it would be difficult and may not be politically feasible to convert it to a public facility in the future.

Sam

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 3, 2004

To: Brooksville City Council;
Hernando County Board of County Commissioners

From: Joseph E. Johnston III, Council Member

Re: Joint Planning Board Meeting

As I advised the City Council at its meeting on Monday, August 2, 2004, I will be out of town and unable to attend the planned Joint Planning Board Meeting scheduled for Thursday, August 5, 2004. I am requesting that this Memorandum be entered into the record of the meeting to ensure that my opinions on two (2) of the matters to be discussed are included.

1. Item 4 H. (Agenda Item; Item G in Committee Report) - Hernando County Metropolitan Planning Organization's Long Range Transportation Plan Update. Specifically, the City Council's request for continuation of a "Constrained" designation for U.S. 41 North within the City.

It is my opinion that the "Constrained" designation should remain in the current LRTP. However, in the event the Majestic Oaks development is constructed and if it is shown to adversely impact the traffic entering U.S. 41 from either Croom Road or Mondon Hill Road and the flows from those roads, City Council should reconsider the designation.

In addition, any approved development of the Smith Dairy property at the corner of Croom Road and U.S. 41 should cause Council to address the type of expanded roadway which would be required to accommodate the additional traffic generated by such development. Also, in the event the property is proposed for development, Council should request the MPO to determine the need for a signal at Croom Road, and the options available to facilitate the residents of Clover Leaf Farms and Clover Leaf Forest in using such a signal.

2. Item 4.I. (Agenda Item; Item H in Committee Report). Supplemental Agreement to the Joint Planning Agreement - Discussion of Collector Road.

After much consideration of this issue, including information provided by Staff, I am of the opinion that the proposed North/South Collector Road (Powell Road Connector) should be a public road.

Although the actual need for the roadway as a public facility may be many years in the future, I believe it will be needed. If the Collector/Connector road is made private it will be politically and/or financially impossible for a future Council to take the facility for public purposes.

In the Committee Report (page 9), several alternatives are listed for consideration. Of these, the one that I proposed to the Developer at a Council Meeting (No. 1 - gate the four entrances onto the road), I still feel is the most cost effective and simplest method to address the problem. The major objection to this proposal raised by the Developer at that time was that residents would want to use the road as a method of reaching a proposed recreation center by golf cart or other non-standard means of transportation. It would seem to me that the pedestrian/bicycle paths adjacent to the roadway could be designed to address that issue.

Of the other alternatives proposed, as described in the Committee Report, I would have no objection to exploring the possibilities. However, I could not agree to consider approval of the current request unless and until an alternative proposal was determined to be feasible and the necessary agreement(s) were in place which would bind those effective parties to it. I would be averse to consideration of any alternative proposal which would increase the cost of the Collector/Connector Road to the City.

DRAFT**JOINT PLANNING BOARD
HERNANDO COUNTY****REGULAR MEETING
OF
AUGUST 5, 2004**

The Hernando County Joint Planning Board met in Regular Session in the John Law Ayers Room, Government Center, Brooksville, Florida, on Thursday, August 5, 2004, at 6:05 p.m. Members of the Board of County Commissioners who were present were: Hannah M. Robinson, Chairperson; Diane B. Rowden, Vice Chairperson; and Mary Aiken, Thomas A. Mylander and Robert C. Schenck, Commissioners. Staff members present were: Gary Adams, County Administrator; Garth Collier, County Attorney; Dennis Dix, MPO Coordinator; Larry Jennings, Growth and Development Services Director; and Sherry Crum, Secretary.

City of Brooksville Council members present included: Mary A. Staib, Mayor; Joe Bernardini, Richard E. Lewis and E.E. "Ernie" Wever, Jr. City staff members present were: Richard Anderson, City Manager; David LaCroix, City Attorney; and Bill Geiger, Community Development Director.

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Chairperson Robinson, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Joint Planning Board - Agenda - Citizens' Input Added to Agenda

Chairperson Robinson requested that Item No. 5 be added to the Agenda as Citizens' Input and that Adjournment be changed to Item No. 6.

The Board and City Council agreed.

DRAFT**Development - City/County - Discussion of Various Growth Issues/County Staff to Consider Proposal Regarding Hampton Ridge Collector Road Issue**

Growth and Development Services Director Larry Jennings reviewed that the Steering Committee Report which had been provided to the Board and the City of Brooksville (City) Council was primarily developed through joint collaboration between the County and City staffs, with the exception of some additional information that the City had requested be included which was at the end of the report.

A staff report was submitted which indicated that the Joint Planning Interlocal Agreement (JPIA) between the City and the County adopted on November 12, 2003, created a Joint Planning Board (JPB) consisting of the combined City Council and the Board. The JPIA also provided for a Steering Committee of designated staff from the County and the City to meet no less than semi-annually to set direction, formulate recommendations and discuss issues regarding coordination of land use, planning, zoning, growth management, environmental considerations, infrastructure, traffic, facilities siting, population and development trends, unmet infrastructure and public facilities needs regarding the US 41 South Planning

DRAFT

-2-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

Area, and any other agreed upon areas of common concern. Staff members from the City and County had met as needed to discuss matters of mutual concern related to the Joint Planning Area (JPA).

The JPIA also required that the County prepare a report consistent with and approved by the Steering Committee for presentation at least semi-annually to the JPB and required that Board to meet no less than once every six months to discuss and/or act on reports of the Steering Committee. The report was directed by the JPIA to reflect the Steering Committee's recommended resolutions, progress since previous meeting(s) and items of concern which were outstanding. This was the first of the required semi-annual reports, which had been reviewed by both the City and County staff.

Mr. Jennings reviewed that the County had adopted a Comprehensive (Comp) Plan Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) on July 14, 2004, as the result of a process begun in March 2002. The EAR process was strongly based in public participation with numerous workshops and public meetings. Governmental entities were invited to participate through a scoping meeting which was held on March 27, 2003, and attended by representatives of approximately one dozen governments and agencies, including the City. He noted that prior to adoption, a proposed EAR had been sent to the City (along with other State, regional, and local governments and agencies) for review and comment. County Planning Department staff had begun preparation of the EAR-based Comp Plan amendments which must be adopted within 18 months following the Department of Community Affairs' determination of sufficiency.

Community Development Director Bill Geiger indicated that the County had also participated in the City's EAR process and noted that the report had been completed.

Mr. Jennings reviewed that the County Utilities Department had initiated a potable water supply planning project, which was in the early stages. He noted that the County staff would inform the consultants of the Interlocal Agreement (IA) establishing the water and sewer First Right to Serve Area (FRSA) and the JPIA. As this project proceeded, the City would be kept informed of matters of potential impact to the JPA.

Mr. Geiger reviewed that the City was continuing with the replacement of its older supply wells. The ultimate goal was to construct two new public supply wells at the existing Hope Hill Wellfield, and two at the Pasco-Hernando Community College (PHCC) site. A 250,000-gallon elevated storage tank would be installed at the PHCC site. As of this date, one new well at the Hope Hill Wellfield and one test well at PHCC had been completed. Water and sewer lines were being extended south on US 41 to serve the Southern Hills Plantation (SHP) development and the Fairgrounds. A contract was in place for the design and permitting of water lines to extend west along the north side of SR 50 terminating at Lykes Dublin Road. Every effort would be made to interconnect the City and County systems in this area because the County would be serving the new Brooksville Regional Hospital (BRH) site which was adjacent to Lykes Dublin Road. The City may require developers to construct other water and sewer infrastructure to serve development within the City's FRSA. Any development which overlapped the City and County FRSA would

DRAFT

DRAFT

-3-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

require coordination between the City and County staffs to determine which entity would provide utility service. Later in the meeting, Mr. Geiger replied to concerns expressed by Comm. Aiken that structurally, the elevated well would be engineered and designed to withstand 120 mile per hour winds.

Comm. Aiken questioned if that would be costly, and if there was a less expensive place to build the well.

Mr. Geiger advised that the City would mandate that the well be built that way regardless of the location.

Mr. Jennings reviewed that the County Utilities Department had initiated a wastewater facilities planning project which would cover the western portion of the county, and was in the very early stages. The staff had informed consultants of the FRSA IA and the JPIA. As this project proceeded, the City would be kept informed of matters of potential impact to the JPA.

Mr. Geiger reviewed that the City's sewer rehabilitation project was well underway and that to date, approximately \$3 million in grant funds had been received. He noted that smoke testing and videotaping of the oldest sewers was underway. He reported that sewer and reuse lines were being extended south along US 41 to serve the Fairgrounds and SHP. A contract with an engineering firm was in place for the design and permitting of sewer lines extending west along the north side of SR 50 terminating at Lykes Dublin Road. Plans were underway to increase the City's sewer treatment capacity by 0.5 million gallons per day (mgd) within 2 to 3 years and 1.5 mgd within 5 to 6 years, for a total capacity of approximately 3.0 mgd. This expansion would include public access reuse capacity in order to reduce the use of groundwater from the City wells.

DRAFT
Mr. Geiger reviewed that the Majestic Oaks project, a development project located both in the JPA and the FRSA, was a combined planned development project located near the northeast corner of the intersection of Mondon Hill Road and McIntyre Road. The project area was approximately 433 acres in size and included plans for 600 plus residential units. Of the 433 acres, approximately 343 acres was within the City's FRSA. Pursuant to the IA and in coordination with the County review process, the City had advised the developer that the City had water and sewer plant capacity to serve this project. He noted that the developer was currently in the process of negotiating a utility service agreement with the City.

Mr. Geiger reviewed that BRH was being built within the County's FRSA, and the County was planning to provide utility service to BRH, with the City providing service to the related medical office facility. The City currently planned to extend water and sewer lines west on SR 50 (including the medical offices), and provide for a potential standby supply arrangement or point of interconnection with the County's utility system.

DRAFT

DRAFT

-4-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

Chairperson Robinson understood that when the FRSA Map (FRSAM) was created, the interconnection was a key issue deemed important to provide, which would benefit BRH, and she questioned if that would occur. Mr. Geiger indicated that extending the lines to BRH was in the City's Capital Facilities Plan.

Mr. Jennings noted that there was a defined FRSA for both of these projects and that the FRSA IA contained the means to determine who would serve within the various areas. He noted that the Utilities Department would negotiate interconnection with the County's Utility system when the City reached the point of constructing their lines on the west side.

In response to Comm. Aiken, Mr. Jennings utilized overhead projection to display the FRSAM and reviewed that the County provided water service to Dogwood Estates north of Majestic Oaks and the City provided service to Clover Leaf Farms and Clover Leaf Forest located west of Majestic Oaks. He reviewed where the City's and County's FRSA boundaries met.

In response to concerns expressed by Comm. Aiken regarding current customer utility rates, Mr. Geiger explained that the utility agreement being negotiated was for the new Majestic Oaks development and did not include any portion of the existing Dogwood Estates.

With regard to capital improvement projects within the JPA, Mr. Jennings reviewed that the Capital Improvements Element (CIE) of the County's Comp Plan was updated annually and that a proposed Comp Plan Amendment (CPAM) to update the CIE was approved by the Board on July 14, 2004, for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). He highlighted several projects involving roads, parks and recreation, and water and sewer facilities, within the JPA which were scheduled to be addressed within the next five years.

Mr. Geiger reviewed that the CIE of the City's Comp Plan was updated annually with the most recent amendment adopted on March 15, 2004. He summarized capital improvements and special projects, which included roads, parks and recreation, and utility facilities, currently included in the City's plan for the JPA.

Mr. Jennings questioned when the City or developer would approach the County staff regarding the ROW through the Fairgrounds for the proposed north/south collector road.

Mr. Geiger conveyed that the developer anticipated contacting the County in September 2004.

Mr. Jennings recounted that on July 14, 2004, the County adopted a CPAM to add an Airport Master Plan into the County's Comp Plan. This CPAM would provide for better Airport planning and closer coordination with the Comp Plan. Review copies of the proposed and adopted CPAMs would be provided to the City. Mr. Geiger reviewed that on August 2, 2004, the City had considered the transmittal to the DCA of five land use amendments to its Comp Plan. Three of these were for public uses and two were for private

DRAFT

DRAFT

-5-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

development. All five of the amendments were in conjunction with annexation of land into the City. Of the three public land use amendments, two were for the inclusion of portions of State road ROWs that were annexed into the City's incorporated area with the purpose of improving public safety response needs. The third public land use amendment was a water well and water storage site under the City's ownership that was annexed into the City. Of the two private land use plan requests, one was for a parcel that was annexed into the City at US 41/Wiscon Road in which the petitioner was requesting a Commercial land use designation; and the other was for property annexed on the southwest corner of SR 50 and Mobley Road, in which the petitioner was proposing a residential condominium project with a requested future land use designation of Multi-family (MF)/Mobile Home (MH). The staff report included a table which outlined the Future Land Use Map Amendments proposed by the City.

In response to Chairperson Robinson, Mr. Geiger reviewed that the proposed project located at SR 50/Mobley Road would have a frontage road; however, they were currently moving through the land use amendment process and zoning had not been addressed. He noted that the City had held discussions with Mr. Charles Sasser, the petitioner, regarding the need to establish a ROW for a frontage road across his property; however, nothing had been finalized.

Comm. Mylander questioned how much land was involved in the SR 50/Mobley Road project.

Mr. Geiger explained that the City's Land Use categories included a combined MF/MH category which provided for either use or both uses; however, establishing any kind of MH park required approval of a planned development project concept for City zoning, which was a separate process. He pointed out that the only reason a MF density was being considered for this project was because the proposal was for approximately 7.5 units per acre, which was just over the threshold between Single-family and MF under the City's Comp Plan.

Comm. Mylander felt that consideration should be given to how the City envisioned addressing the evacuation of MHs considering the number of facilities available for that purpose.

Mr. Geiger stated that the City had taken that into consideration.

MPO Coordinator Dennis Dix utilized overhead projection to display the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update Map and reviewed that the LRTP was updated at three-year intervals with the current update due for completion in approximately December 2004. The first step in the LRTP process was the MPO endorsement in June 2004 of the 2025 Transportation Needs Plan (TNP), which identified transportation improvements needed to support projected growth through the planning period. Over the next two months, project costs and anticipated revenues would be

DRAFT

DRAFT

-6-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

evaluated in the development of the Cost Affordable Plan. The LRTP was a multi-modal transportation plan, addressing roads on the functionally classified highway network, goods movements, airport access, public transportation, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Mr. Dix reported that the MPO had recently reviewed the draft TNP which was crafted prior to the adoption of a cost affordable plan. He explained that the TNP was a policy constraint plan which considered social, economic and ROW constraints. He utilized the map being displayed via overhead projection and detailed the major projects. He indicated that the staff was seeking policy direction and questioned whether the City still desired, as a matter of policy constraint, that US 41, north of the eastern terminus of the one-way pairs to Lake Lindsey Road, remain two lanes since there was a need for four lanes north of Lake Lindsey Road.

Mayor Staib read aloud written comments submitted by Councilman Joe Johnston, III, which expressed his opinion regarding the request for continuation of a constrained designation for a portion of US 41 north within the City.

Councilman Bernardini questioned if there were any plans to redesign the intersection of US 41 and Mondon Hill Road since the location at the bottom of a hill and on a curve was dangerous.

Mr. Dix replied that there were currently no plans; however, that could be researched.

Mr. Jennings pointed out that the intent was to try and project the type of road network needed 20 years in the future and to program that and development activities in order to secure the ROW. He noted that if US 41 was four-laned, improvements for the intersection of US 41 and Mondon Hill Road would have to be part of that project since they would not be able to four-lane US 41 otherwise.

Councilman Bernardini questioned if there were any plans to improve that intersection even if the road was not widened to four lanes.

Mr. Jennings stated that the County did not have any plans to improve that intersection, which he noted was located within the City.

Mr. Geiger reported that the City did not have any specific plans for that intersection. He indicated that that would involve Department of Transportation (DOT) ROW which would normally be addressed first by the MPO and then with DOT. He suggested that that City's MPO representative address that with the MPO Board.

DRAFT

DRAFT

-7-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

In response to a request by Chairperson Robinson, Mr. Jennings indicated that the staff could add that issue to the next MPO Agenda. He suggested that the City may wish to speak with their representative in the interim since the next meeting was not scheduled until October 2004.

Comm. Rowden questioned why the City would not want US 41 four-laned.

Councilman Bernardini clarified that the request for constraint had come from Councilman Johnston, who was not present.

Comm. Rowden questioned if that was the wishes of the other City Council members.

Mayor Staib replied negatively.

DRAFT

In response to Comm. Aiken, Mr. Dix displayed the LRTP map via overhead projection and noted that there was a need for capacity improvements throughout the network. He identified a parallel collector road extending from SR 50 to Powell Road that would connect to US 41.

Mr. Jennings clarified for Comm. Aiken that that road would be discussed later in the meeting, and had been referred to as the north/south collector road. He noted that the map was generally consistent with the City's existing Comp Plan for their future roadway network. He verified that the road did not currently exist; however, the City had a development agreement for the construction of a portion of that road.

Mr. Geiger indicated that the time line for the east/west road, which would be known as Southern Hills Boulevard once it was constructed, and the collector road were under the City's CIP. He noted that Southern Hills Boulevard was currently being built, with completion anticipated during the first quarter of 2005. He continued that the section of the collector road directly north was scheduled for completion by calendar year 2008, but could occur sooner depending on the time line of the current development.

Comm. Aiken questioned if the road would be private or public.

Mr. Geiger noted that the Supplemental Interlocal Agreement referred to a connector road and did not specify private or public. He felt it was more important to discuss the issue of connectivity, since the City strongly believed in building that road into the road network and anticipated working out a beneficial situation for all parties involved to achieve connectivity between Southern Hills Boulevard to Powell Road.

Comm. Schenck questioned if the future land use for US 41 was all residential or rural.

DRAFT

DRAFT

-8-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

Mr. Jennings advised that a residential and commercial urban area to the northeast of the City was shown on the existing County Comp Plan which, along with some of the future land use issues within the City, drove the four-laning of US 41. He noted that that area was shown as being an urban area and if that type of travel was considered, a four-lane roadway was indicated in the future.

Mr. Jennings confirmed for Comm. Schenck that the County did not have the necessary ROW for four-laning the roadway. He felt that when ROW needs were placed on plans for the extended future, efforts needed to begin with regard to preserving the ROW and he explained why.

In response to further questioning by Comm. Schenck, Mr. Jennings remarked that this issue would be addressed at the next MPO meeting for a final decision as to whether it would be included in the needs program as a two- or four-lane roadway. He noted that if a decision to restrain US 41 to two lanes was made, that would affect the Comp Plan and may necessitate the City and the County giving consideration to reducing the intensity of development.

Councilman Bernardini, in response to Comm. Rowden, explained that the reason Councilman Johnston had asked for constraints on US 41 north was so that the State would not handle the widening similar to the US 41 south widening and so that the City could provide more input. He recalled that the City had concurred with Councilman Johnston's request; therefore, it was the entire City Council and not solely Councilman Johnston's view.

DRAFT

Comm. Mylander, as a follow-up to Councilman Bernardini's question regarding Mondon Hill Road, observed that if construction began on the Majestic Oaks development, the expense to government would occur first. He felt that long-range planning considerations needed to include Mondon Hill Road and Croom Road since there was limited access for construction equipment and Mondon Hill Road was already a dangerous intersection.

Councilman Lewis noted that when the City had agreed to have a constrained designation for US 41 north, they had determined that that should be for a one-year period with a review by the City in 2005 and he elaborated.

Mr. Dix responded to questioning from Councilman Lewis regarding a possible collector road between Wiscon Road and Powell Road

Mr. Jennings indicated that that particular road segment was included in the County's Comp Plan. He commented that the other issue was that the County's Comp Plan indicated a predominant amount of rural property between California Street and US 41. He specified that if that area became urbanized, the County

DRAFT

-9-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

DRAFT

August 5, 2004

would have to contend with numerous environmental constraints due to the number of flood plain areas and the karst topography. He continued that if that transitioned to urban, they would be looking at the same kind of road network being considered for the east side, just as the City had done as they urbanized the east side.

In response to concerns expressed by the City Council, Mr. Jennings noted that the relationship with DOT had changed significantly since the US 41 south project had been completed and he explained why. He suggested that one way to address the City's concern was for the County to recognize the need for four-laning but show the US 41 corridor as a corridor of concern.

Mr. Geiger felt it was important for the City to consider this carefully since they were not planning for future needs if the road was constrained. He advised that with Mr. Jennings suggestion the City would have input and could better plan for the future. He strongly urged the City Council to consider taking that approach.

Mr. Jennings reviewed the Hampton Ridge Annexation and CPAMs and noted that the issues which were outstanding at the last joint meeting had been resolved. The City's CPAMs had been determined to be in compliance by DCA. The City had zoned the Southern Hills Plantation portion of the property and subdivision platting was in process. The County staff had provided comments on plans as they were submitted for review.

DRAFT

Mr. Jennings outlined the development review coordination procedures and noted that all County rezonings and zoning type cases within the JPA were sent to the City and all City rezonings and zoning type cases within the JPA were sent to the County for review prior to the advertised public hearings. County and City coordination processes in place prior to adoption of the JPA continued. The County's Building Division continued to contractually serve as the City's Building Official for purposes of development review, permitting and inspection, which meant that all development activity that occurred within the City went through the County development review process.

The staff report indicated that a representative of the City had discussed the MPO's cooperation in constraining US 41 from Jefferson Street northward within and near the City limits. Classification as "constrained" indicated community policy to maintain a highway within the limitations of the constraint. An example would be a highway prevented from having its ROW widened to accommodate more lanes and carry more traffic. Constraining highways in and around the City would limit the amount of new traffic from development that could be accommodated by the highway network, and would necessitate County and City CPAMs to reduce the intensity of development in the vicinity of the constrained highways.

Mr. Geiger reviewed with regard to the Hampton Ridge north/south collector road extension to Powell Road, that at the joint meeting of the City Council and the Board on November 12, 2003, at which the JPA was

DRAFT

DRAFT

-10-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

adopted, there was considerable discussion of the collector roads within the 1,600 acres of the Hampton Ridge annexation which had been added to the highway network in the City's CPAM. Based on the discussion, the County expected the collector roads indicated in the City's Comp Plan to be public collector roads. The County staff considered the public collector roads necessary for connectivity in the highway network, to provide parallel capacity to US 41 and to improve disaster evacuation options for the populated areas to the west. In response to a developer's request, the City was considering a proposal to replace the southern portion of the north/south collector road (from Southern Hills Boulevard south to Powell Road), which would extend through the area to be developed as The Cascades, with a private road. The developer's representatives had provided a traffic analysis and concluded that the public collector road was not needed. County staff did not concur with those conclusions, and considered the public collector road necessary for both connectivity and capacity considerations.

Options which had been reviewed and considered by the City regarding the developer's request included: (1) Having the developer construct the connector road as a public facility and take the community off the road. The developer rejected this option as being inconsistent with their type of development; (2) Having the City and County plan an alternative connector road outside the Hampton Ridge property. This may facilitate the need for future road connectivity but would represent an expense to the City, the County and developers in this area in the future; (3) Requiring future development along the US 41 corridor to construct frontage (or reverse frontage) roads in connection with development or redevelopment of their property. This should be done regardless of whether the connector road through the Hampton Ridge property was public or private. A problem associated with compelling the construction of frontage roads by developers in conjunction with their projects was the time it took to achieve connectivity for the road segments to function properly; and (4) If the connector road was permitted (initially) as a private road facility, modifying the City's development agreement with Hampton Ridge to reduce the impact fee credit area. This would provide a revenue source for the City to use in conjunction with effecting road connectivity at some point in the future. Although US 41 was classified as a growth corridor, there was no guarantee that the offset in impact fee revenues would be adequate for the City to acquire, design and construct a connector road facility in the future. It may be noted that a large portion of the impact fee credit area as established by the agreement was not located within the incorporated area, and the City would not be able to collect impact fees or establish credits unless the land was annexed and then developed. The developer had indicated a reluctance to agree with eliminating the impact fee credit area west of US 41.

City staff had prepared the following list of pros and cons associated with the petitioner's proposal for the Powell Road connector to be private versus public. The pros were: (1) That the road would be constructed to meet City standards and would already meet public road standards if at some point in the future the City deemed it appropriate to condemn the road to create a public facility; (2) Construction and maintenance of this road would be at the developer's cost; (3) Based on the analysis provided by the developer, the impacts

DRAFT

DRAFT

-11-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

from the difference (of whether this road was private or public) on the public road network were negligible through the year 2030; (4) Approximately 900 future dwelling units from Levitt's planned community (The Cascades) would have access to the alternative directions offered by the collector road, which units represented approximately 30% of the development potential in this area; (5) If over time, a reverse frontage road was developed along US 41 connecting Southern Hills Boulevard to Powell Road, the need for an additional (public) Powell Road connector in this area may not be necessary; (6) Hampton Ridge Developers, LLC, was willing to consider shrinking the Transportation Impact Fee Reimbursement Area established in the Development Agreement to allow the City to collect and keep impact fees in the area west of the site and south of Southern Hills Boulevard (assuming this area was eventually annexed and developed, this would provide a funding source to address costs related to the reverse frontage road referenced in Item No. 4, including planning, design and construction, and/or costs related to acquiring the Powell Road Connector being constructed by the developer, if deemed necessary to do so at some point in the future); and (7) In all respects other than the private road issue, this development proposal was consistent with City plans for this area and the development would economically benefit the City and the County. The cons were that: (1) The general public would not have this facility available as an alternative to the existing public road network in this area; (2) If future condemnation was required to make this a public road, it would be at the City's cost; and (3) If development of this road was permitted as a private facility, it would be difficult and may not be politically feasible to convert it to a public facility in the future.

DRAFT

Mr. Geiger noted that there had been a proposal to build a collector road as originally designed and represented in the City's Comp Plan; however, the developer had insisted that in order to market the type of development they dealt with, the road would need to be private which presented a problem with regard to connectivity. He reported that the developer had recently submitted a proposal which he had not had an opportunity to discuss with the City Council, to construct a road through their property to achieve connectivity between Powell Road and Southern Hills Boulevard, which would be built to a local road standard versus a collector road standard. He mentioned that this would save the developer between \$500,000 and \$600,000. He detailed that the City would require, by agreement, that the developer acquire the ROW to establish the road corridor between Southern Hills Boulevard and Powell Road either directly adjacent to the west side of the property or in the vicinity between the west side of the property and US 41. He noted that the developer of Hampton Ridge would be responsible for giving up their impact fee credit area, which would provide a revenue source for actual construction of the road. He stated that the City would base the need for the road to be constructed on the performance standards when the intersection of US 41 and SR 50 was approaching a Level of Service (LOS) deterioration from C to D. He specified that the City would limit the development to a density not to exceed 400 units until sufficient property was acquired and dedicated to the City to be used as ROW for that future collector road.

DRAFT

DRAFT

-12-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

Mr. Jennings indicated that he had learned of this proposal earlier in the day. He noted that the County's concern was connectivity between Powell Road and SR 50; however, the County was willing to consider other alignments than through the Levitt property. He conveyed that the concept of an alignment to the west had some merit and could be made to work. He asserted that from the County's perspective, more detail was needed with regard to an agreement since he believed the County would want to make sure that their cost interests were appropriately served. He felt this could solve the problem for all parties and provide the desired connectivity.

Councilman Bernardini questioned if it was permissible to have a reverse frontage road serve as a collector road.

Mr. Cliff Manuel, President of Coastal Engineering Associates, Inc., explained that the concept was for the road to be realigned to provide the network and the benefit of both a reverse frontage road in certain areas and connectivity from SR 50 to Powell Road. He noted that the issues included how much access would be allowed and how much ROW was proposed for that function. He stated that if the ROW was restricted to 60' and significant commercial access was allowed, it would not serve the same purpose. He indicated that they were proposing increased ROW and had discussed with the City a width of 120'. He stated that the roadway would be accessed on a limited basis to provide connection for north/south and east/west traffic which would need to be worked out between the City and the developer. He explained that the concept was for the road, which was originally aligned so that a portion would be a public roadway through the middle of The Cascades, a private residential community, to be realigned. He noted that the sections where the newly-aligned road abutted commercial property would serve as both a reverse frontage road and collector road; however, that did not preclude that the commercial area would have other connectivity between the highway and the roadway system.

DRAFT

Councilman Bernardini questioned if the reverse frontage road between Southern Hills Boulevard and US 41/SR 50 would be eliminated.

Mr. Manuel replied affirmatively.

Mr. Manuel replied to Councilman Bernardini that the proposed road would meet the standards of a development agreement with the City. He noted that the road would be constructed as two lanes and designed for up to four lanes.

Comm. Rowden expressed concern that the City and County were "jumping through hoops" for the developer and considering giving up impact fees which took time to collect since numerous homes needed to be built before enough funds were available to build a road. She felt the developer should build the road to serve the development as the development was being built. She expressed concern with waiting for a problem to occur when they knew that it would occur. She understood that the City had approved providing

DRAFT

DRAFT

-13-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

the developer with the ability to require the homeowners to pay for all of the improvements to the roads within the development.

Mr. Geiger related that most of the roads involved would be private roads internal to the development itself, and not those considered off-site roads that would be impact fee eligible.

Comm. Rowden understood that those fees would be in addition to the impact fees the homeowners would pay.

Mr. Geiger replied affirmatively. He noted that an enhanced LOS would be provided to the residents of that development through the community development district process.

Comm. Rowden felt that the County's roads needed to be enhanced before a problem occurred, which involved managing growth.

Mr. Geiger explained that the developer of Southern Hills Plantation would be required to build Southern Hills Boulevard into their development. He specified that the City had negotiated for the owner of the entire 1,600 acres to contribute \$7.7 million of infrastructure, which included construction of the north/south road and which would remove the City from having to negotiate an arrangement with whoever purchased a portion of that property. He noted that that was why that portion of roadway being an off-site improvement to the actual development would be considered impact fee eligible from the City's perspective. He noted that it would take several years for the developer to recoup their money and the City did not have the means to build this type of public infrastructure upfront and continue to collect impact fees.

Comm. Rowden commented that the City would not have to redesign and build the road if the developer was not constructing a development.

Mr. Geiger pointed out that the City would also not have the economic benefit from the development.

Comm. Rowden felt that the developer had an economic advantage considering the price of the lots. She reiterated that the improvements were needed up front, in order to prevent future problems.

Mr. Geiger disagreed that the City had portrayed that they were waiting for a problem. He indicated that the City shared similar concerns with the County staff regarding road connectivity which they were trying to address while trying to accommodate a developer who was a known quality product, at the same time.

DRAFT

-14-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

DRAFT

August 5, 2004

Councilman Lewis supported connectivity and reviewed the benefits that would result from the developer's proposal.

Comm. Schenck understood that the new alignment of the north/south road would connect to Powell Road and that the developer of The Cascades would still have a 60' private road which would be the main entrance to that development.

Mr. Geiger replied affirmatively.

Comm. Schenck believed the goal of connectivity might be achieved, if the Planning staff agreed, since it appeared there would be two entrance/exit points off Powell Road. He understood that the staff's review would consider a cost benefit based on when the road would be needed and how long it would take to recoup the impact fees, which would be presented to each board individually.

Mr. Geiger indicated that the City would work toward an agreement with the developer and provide that information to the County staff.

Chairperson Robinson understood that Mr. Jennings had indicated that conceptually, the staff recommended that the Board give the proposal some serious consideration.

Mr. Jennings replied affirmatively. He mentioned that the staff would need to review the County's stance from an economic standpoint and report back to the Board.

DRAFT

Mayor Staib read aloud written comments submitted by Councilman Johnston which expressed his opinion that the north/south collector road should be a public road.

Councilman Lewis noted that Councilman Johnston had not been privy to the developer's latest proposal with regard to the realigning of the road, a \$500,000 contribution and the return of impact fees.

The City Council agreed to take no action until Councilman Johnston had been provided the latest information.

Councilman Bernardini questioned if only the south impact fee credit area was under consideration or both the north and south impact fee credit areas.

Mr. Geiger understood that the developer's intent was the south impact fee credit area; however, he recommended that both be considered.

DRAFT

DRAFT

-15-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

Councilman Bernardini questioned if The Cascades collector road was needed and, if not, suggested that the developer be allowed to build a private road within his development and that impact fees be collected. He suggested that an alternative was to use the impact fees to improve Hope Hill Road and extend it to connect to Powell Road.

Mr. Geiger did not feel that that road was needed today; however, there would be a future need for connectivity which should be planned for at this time.

Chairperson Robinson noted that it would serve as a frontage road parallel to US 41 since the access needs in that region would depend upon development in the area.

Councilman Bernardini did not feel that the type of road suggested could be used for both a reverse frontage road and collector road.

Chairperson Robinson felt the road could be designed for the needs at the time of development as long as the ROW was available, considering that costs for ROW would be substantial in the future. She understood that the planners were suggesting that ROW be reserved to provide options for the future.

Councilman Wever remarked that he would accept an indication from the engineer that the road could be used as both a frontage and through road.

RECESS/RECONVENE

The Board recessed at 7:30 p.m. and reconvened at 7:50 p.m.

DRAFT

Mr. Manuel pointed out that the developer had proposed an alternative to address the fact that the planned roadway network was needed for the area for connectivity, moving traffic from SR 50 to US 41 and relieving some of the impact associated with US 41 traffic. He commented that the developer felt this was a good idea and desired to participate, assuming that the Board and the City Council approved. He reviewed that the developer planned to fund the road up front and provide the City with \$500,000 to acquire the ROW which would also allow the Levitt community to build their private community without that responsibility.

Citizens' Input

Ms. Sherry McIntyre supported having Southern Hills Plantation in the community as it would increase the City's tax base. She supported a reverse frontage road since she felt it was necessary in commercial areas; however, she expressed concern with giving impact fee credits. She asserted that many issues within the northern impact fee credit area needed to be addressed, including Wiscon Road and its intersection with US 41 and she elaborated. She asked that the Board and City Council consider what they would need in the next five years in the area where impact fees were collected.

DRAFT

DRAFT

-16-

Joint Planning Board Meeting

August 5, 2004

Mrs. Janey Baldwin felt that a strategic plan should lead the LRTP and suggested a 2025 "summit" to address growth either collectively or individually.

Mrs. Anna Liisa Covell understood that if the north/south road from Southern Hills Boulevard was a frontage road it would not be classified as a collector road and therefore, would not provide impact fee credits which would impact the discussion on how this would be accomplished. She felt if the ROW and road width were not available at this time and the road was not built as a collector road, they could not assume that they would have the money from impact fees or impact fee credits to purchase the ROW.

Chairperson Robinson advised that she would not ask for staff response at this time since the staff had not had time to conduct research; however, she expected that at the next meeting at which these issues were discussed, those concerns would be addressed.

DRAFT

Mr. Jennings agreed. He indicated noted that some of the issues regarding the road status would be included in the analysis which the staff would need to consider as recommendations were made to the Board regarding this latest proposal.

Mr. Geiger agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

KAREN NICOLAI, CLERK

HANNAH M. ROBINSON, CHAIRPERSON**DRAFT**